



Slip Copy, 2011 WL 5402878 (W.D.N.C.)
(Cite as: 2011 WL 5402878 (W.D.N.C.))

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court, W.D. North Carolina,
Charlotte Division.
Bianca ELLIS and Mark and Jacqueline Sroka, indi-
vidually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,
Plaintiffs,
v.
LOUISIANA-PACIFIC CORPORATION, Defend-
ant.

No. 3:11CV191.
Nov. 8, 2011.

[Daniel Kent Bryson](#), [Matthew Earl Lee](#), [Scott Criss-](#)
[man Harris](#), Lewis & Roberts, P.L.L.C., Raleigh, NC,
for Plaintiffs.

[Meghan Naomi Knight](#), [Richard T. Boyette](#), Cranfill
Sumner & Hartzog LLP, Raleigh, NC, [James E.](#)
[Weatherholtz](#), Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice,
PLLC, Charleston, SC, for Defendant.

ORDER

[GRAHAM MULLEN](#), District Judge.

*1 This matter is before the court upon Defend-
ant's Motion to Dismiss pursuant to [Rule 12\(b\)\(6\) of](#)
[the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure](#).

Plaintiff homeowners filed this purported class
action asserting claims for negligence, unfair and
deceptive trade practices, and a claim for declaratory
relief, all arising out of the use of Defendant's alleg-
edly defective Trimboard. Trimboard is a manufac-
tured wood exterior trim product used on Plaintiffs'
homes. The Trimboard product was covered by an
express warranty. Plaintiffs acknowledge that they
have no express warranty claim in the present lawsuit
because they are putative class members in a separate,
pending class action lawsuit in the Eastern District of
North Carolina, in which their express warranty
claims are addressed (*Hart v. Louisiana-Pacific*
Corp., No. 2:08CV 00047 (E.D.N.C., filed Oct. 22,
2008)).

Defendant moves to dismiss the claims herein for
failure to state a claim upon which relief can be

granted. In ruling on a motion to dismiss pursuant to
[Rule 12\(b\)\(6\)](#) or a motion for judgment on the plead-
ings pursuant to [Rule 12\(c\)](#), the court must consider
whether the plaintiff has plead "enough facts to state a
claim to relief that is plausible on its face." [Bell At-](#)
[lantic Corp. v. Twombly](#), 127 S.Ct. 1955, 1974 (2007).
However, the court need not accept legal conclusions
drawn from the facts, unwarranted inferences, unreas-
onable conclusions, or arguments. [Giarratano v.](#)
[Johnson](#), 521 F.3d 298, 302 (4th Cir.2008).

Defendant argues that Plaintiffs' claims must be
dismissed because they are barred by the economic
loss rule. The economic loss rule bars recovery for
purely economic loss in tort when a contract exists
between the parties. See [Ports Authority v. Lloyd A.](#)
[Fry Roofing Co.](#), 294 N.C. 73, 81–83, 240 S.E.2d 345,
350–51 (1978), *rejected in part on other grounds*,
[Trustees of Rowan Tech. College v. J. Hyatt Ham-](#)
[mond Assoc., Inc.](#), 313 N.C. 230, 328 S.E.2d 274
(1985); [Ford v. All-Dry of the Carolinas, Inc.](#), 2011
WL 1483726 (N.C.App. Apr. 19, 2011). Even when
the parties are not in privity of contract, however, the
economic loss rule may still apply, as North Carolina
courts focus on the availability of a contractual reme-
dy, including a remedy for breach of warranty. [Kelly](#)
[v. Georgia-Pacific, LLC](#), 671 F.Supp.2d 785, 794
(E.D.N.C.2009). In *Kelly*, the plaintiff homeowner
sued the designer and manufacturer of an allegedly
defective product called "PrimeTrim," which was
used in the construction of his home. Plaintiff alleged
that he suffered damages to his home due to moisture
penetration caused by the defective trim. *Id.* at 788.
Although he raised an express warranty claim, plain-
tiff alleged that his remedies under the warranty were
not adequate and therefore he also asserted claims for
negligence and violation of the North Carolina Unfair
and Deceptive Trade Practices Act, among other
claims. *Id.* at 787–89. The defendants acknowledged
the viability of plaintiff's express warranty claim, but
moved to dismiss the other claims. The court held that
because plaintiff had an available warranty remedy,
and was only seeking damages for economic loss,
North Carolina's economic loss rule barred plaintiff's
negligence claim. *Id.* at 796. Because the Plaintiffs
herein have an available warranty remedy which is the
subject of a separate action, they may not also pursue a
negligence claim against the Defendant.

Slip Copy, 2011 WL 5402878 (W.D.N.C.)
(Cite as: **2011 WL 5402878 (W.D.N.C.)**)

*2 The economic loss rule also bars claims of unfair and deceptive trade practices where the only alleged damage from a defective product is to the product itself and “the allegations of unfair and deceptive trade practices are intertwined with the breach of contract or warranty claims.” Bussian v. DaimlerChrysler Corp., 411 F.Supp.2d 614, 625 (M.D.N.C.2006) (finding that the economic loss rule barred plaintiff's unfair and deceptive trade practices claim where plaintiff alleged that the defendants had superior knowledge of defect, failed to warn consumers, and continued to promote the product.). A plaintiff is not entitled to attempt multiple recoveries by asserting an UDTP claim for false representations where the damage incurred by the plaintiff is not separate and apart from the damage arising out of a breach of warranty claim. See Ford, 2011 WL 148726. Like Plaintiffs' negligence claim, their UDTP claim is barred by the economic loss rule because the only alleged damage is that the Trimboard on Plaintiffs' homes is failing or is “defective but has not yet manifested signs of failure.” (Compl.¶ 25). This is the same damage upon which the breach of warranty claim is based. Plaintiffs' UDTP claim is intertwined with their breach of warranty claim and is therefore barred by the economic loss rule.

Plaintiffs also seek a declaratory ruling pursuant to Rule 23 that Trimboard is defective and prematurely fails, that the warranty is unconscionable, that Defendant must notify owners of defects, that Defendant must reassess all prior warranty claims and pay the full cost of repairs and damages, and that Defendant must pay the cost of inspection to determine whether any class members's Trimboard needs replacement. (Compl.¶¶ 66–68). Any challenge to the enforceability of the warranty or the operation of the warranty program are issues which either are or could have been raised in the pending breach of warranty lawsuit in the Eastern District of North Carolina. Accordingly, the court dismisses this claim.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendant's Motion to Dismiss is hereby GRANTED.

W.D.N.C.,2011.
Ellis v. Louisiana-Pacific Corp.
Slip Copy, 2011 WL 5402878 (W.D.N.C.)

END OF DOCUMENT